

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS FROM  
JUNIOR COLLEGE TO THAT OF NATIVE OKLAHOMA  
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

SEP 27 1938

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS FROM  
JUNIOR COLLEGE TO THAT OF NATIVE OKLAHOMA  
AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

O. E. COWLEY

"

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1937

Submitted to the School of Education  
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

1938

LIBRARY  
A. B. COLLIER  
STILLWATER OKLA

APPROVED:

*D. L. Reed*

In Charge of Thesis

*N. Conroy*

Dean of School of Education

*D. C. McIntosh*

Dean of Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express my appreciation to those who have given their time and advice: Dr. Conger, who was never too busy to give my work careful consideration and whose advice was always friendly and readily accepted by the writer; Dr. Scroggs, my advisor; Dr. Reed, who suggested the title of the thesis and has given his time and advice generously; Dr. Fisk, a former president of a junior college in California, who has given much valuable information on various angles of the work; Mr. Flinn and Mr. John Oliver, who were very kind in giving me desk space in the temporary quarters of the registrar's office in the Engineering Building while Whitehurst Hall was being repaired; my wife, who gave up her summer school work in order to help in assembling data and solving the many arithmetic problems involved in this thesis; and I wish to express my sincere thanks to all of those others who have given their time and advice so cheerfully.

It is my hope that this study will be of value to those who are interested in the junior college work in Oklahoma.

O. E. C.

## INTRODUCTION

X The educational world is vitally interested in the growth of the junior college movement, which promises to modify greatly higher education in America. X Thoughtful educators are eager for facts, for any information which will throw light upon its present status and form a basis for policies of future development. X While several distinct functions are claimed for this latest member of the educational family, there is a general agreement that one of those functions is the preparation of part of its students for advanced work in the upper division of senior institutions. Upon this function, definite facts have been presented.

X There is some contention that students transferring from the junior colleges to senior colleges should be more select than native students of the senior colleges and universities, because of the fact that the weaker students from the junior colleges are not likely to raise the extra effort necessary to change to the senior institution. X On the other hand, there are those who believe that since larger numbers are admitted to the junior colleges, the product sent on to the senior institutions should be less select. X Only about one-fifth of the students finishing the junior college course transfer to the senior colleges.

One of the best criteria for judging a factory is the quality of the product it puts out. The quality of the preparatory work of the junior college is measured by the grade point average of students who transfer to senior institutions.

XThe junior college has made college education available to the masses. It may relieve the higher institutions of the overcrowded conditions and meet the popular demand for higher education. On the other hand, if the work offered by the junior colleges is inferior to the extent that the transferred student cannot use the prerequisites with success to continue work in the senior college, the higher institutions must either lower their standard of work or send the graduates of the junior colleges home as failures.)

#### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

It is the purpose of this study to determine whether or not the student transferred from a junior college to a senior college is as well prepared to continue his work in the higher institution as the student who has two years of training in a senior college. The study will be based upon the summary of an investigation of the performance of students transferred to the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College from Oklahoma and out-of-state junior colleges and the lower division of Oklahoma state teachers' colleges compared with a similar summary of an

investigation of the performance of the native students of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

The data used in this investigation will cover the period from 1930 to 1937, or the period during which the psychological entrance test has been given in the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. The native students are given the test as freshmen, while the transferred students are given the test as juniors. This may make some difference in their respective ranges.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	v
I	THE PROBLEM OF ADJUSTMENT OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS . . . . .	1
II	THE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES	4
III	THE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA . . .	8
IV	A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE BEARING ON THE SUCCESS OF PERFORMANCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS IN THE UNITED STATES .	11
V	PERFORMANCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS IN OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE . . . . .	19
	CONCLUSION . . . . .	28
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	30



## CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF  
ADJUSTMENT OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS

✓ The adjustment of transfer students in a new institution is both institutional and individual in nature. Some students are socially more mature and would adjust themselves in the new institution under even the most disadvantageous circumstances, while some transfers are less mature than the average freshman. On the other hand, many problems are institutional in nature. Anything that causes the student to make a complete readjustment to new conditions would naturally require a longer period of time than for students that have experienced similar conditions. In general, it takes the same time for transfer students to become adjusted to social and scholastic surroundings as it does for the freshmen. X

A study was recently made by Mr. Joel V. Barreman of the relative scholastic achievement of transfers and native Stanford students in the Elementary Sociology class. This study involved 827 students, or the total enrollment in this Sociology class over a period of ten quarters, from 1928 to 1933. There was a total of 475 native Stanford students and 352 transfer students. The transfers were then divided into what he termed recent and former transfers. The recent transfers had been there two quarters or less before enrolling in the Sociology

class; the so-called former transfers had been in the university from three to ten quarters before enrolling in the class.<sup>1</sup>

A comparison of these two groups of transfers with the native Stanford students brought out striking differences. The recent transfers were lower than the native students in sociology percentile-grades by a significant difference, the critical ratio being 4.69. However, this group of recent transfers was also considerably lower than were the native Stanford students, the critical ratio being 4.03. On the other hand, the former transfers had grades about equal to those of the native Stanford students, with a critical ratio of .40; and likewise, their entrance test grades were nearly equal to those of the native Stanford students, with a critical ratio of .97.<sup>2</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that the recent transfers who had enrolled in the sociology class had somewhat lower native ability as shown by the entrance test, than the former transfers. In other words, the quality of transfer students has been getting poorer, as shown by this study at Stanford University. The difference in the grades of the recent and former transfers could not

---

<sup>1</sup> Report: "The First Annual Junior College Conference," University of California, Berkley, California.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

be entirely accounted for by the entrance test scores. The difference in sociology grades between the recent and former transfers gave a critical ratio of 2.38, whereas the difference in entrance test scores between those two groups of transfers gave a critical ratio of 1.53. Hence another conclusion may be drawn, namely, that former transfers were better adjusted to university atmosphere and were able to make better grades. Another finding was that there was practically no difference in grades made by transfer students from other senior colleges and those from junior colleges. This would indicate that it was not primarily a lowering of quality, but a matter of adjustment.

Another study in the same field was that of transfers who had been given a second trial quarter. During the preceding year it became evident that a number of students who almost made a "C" average during the first trial quarter might profit from a second trial quarter. Exactly two-thirds of those who were given a second trial quarter made good--that is, made a "C" average. A series of interviews which were held with these students, made evident the need for a longer period of adjustment. The evidence arising from the interviews indicated that these students did not feel a handicap because of the trial quarter status.<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER II

## THE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE UNITED STATES

The first real separation of the junior college from the senior college came with the reorganized University of Chicago in 1892, under Dr. W. R. Harper, sometimes called the Father of the Junior College. He made the freshman and sophomore work a distinct division which he called the Academic College, with the upper two years called the University College. In 1896, the terms Junior College and Senior College were adopted, and they have been in general use since that time. As far as is known, this is the first use of the term Junior College, although it was not until a few years later that it was used to designate an institution entirely different from the university.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Harper considered the philosophy and problems of this new institution, which included the advantages and disadvantages of the complete separation of the upper and lower division. He states the advantages of the separation as follows:

1. Many students will find it convenient to give up college work at the end of the sophomore year.
2. Many students who would not otherwise do so, will undertake at least two years of college work.

---

<sup>1</sup>

W. C. Eells, The Junior College, p. 47.

3. The professional schools will be able to raise their standards of admission, and in many cases, many who desire a professional education, will take the first two years of college work.
4. Many academies and high schools will be encouraged to develop higher work.
5. Many colleges which have not the means to do the work of the junior and senior years will be satisfied to do the lower division work.<sup>2</sup>

In later years this separate administrative organization has been made in a number of universities, although the designation junior college has been reserved, as a rule, except in the University of Chicago, for lower division institutions and the terms upper and lower division are more common for the degree granting institutions. This segregation has been accomplished in at least eight large universities, although in none of them has there yet been complete abolition of the lower division.<sup>3</sup>

A gradual elimination of the lower division has been started by Johns Hopkins University on the east coast and Stanford University on the west coast. It was the intention of Dr. David Starr Jordan, as early as 1907, to limit Stanford University to the upper division by 1913, but at that time there were not sufficient junior colleges in California to justify such a plan.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Harper, President's Annual Report, University of Chicago, July 1902, Vol. 1, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> W. C. Eells, The Junior College, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 48.

Some writers have traced the beginning of the junior college movement as far back as the Renaissance, to the prolonged secondary school of Sturm at Strassburg, in the sixteenth century. There is some connection in form, but the real influence arises from a modern demand rather than a traditional one.

There are two principal reasons for the development of the junior college: the overcrowded condition of the upper division and the fact that the lower division is really secondary in nature and should be handled as such. Through this treatment, the upper division is left free to devote itself to collegiate work of real merit.

The first public junior college organized separately from a degree granting institution is still in existence. This distinction goes to the Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois, which began operation in 1902. It was due directly to the influence of President Harper's work in the University of Chicago in encouraging the development of the lower two years of college work in connection with the high schools.<sup>5</sup>

Table I shows the increase in number of junior colleges taken at five year intervals since 1900. It should be noted that the first junior colleges as

---

5

T. M. Dean, Junior College Journal, Vol. 1, pp. 429-32, April 1931.

separate organizations, were private. The first legislation authorizing junior colleges was passed in California in 1907.<sup>6</sup>

TABLE I  
GROWTH IN NUMBER OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1900-35

Year	Total	Public	Private
1900	27	0	27
1905	32	1	31
1910	55	3	52
1915	89	15	74
1920	165	40	125
1925	292	88	204
1930	430	162	268
1935	518	213	305

---

<sup>6</sup>

W. C. Eells, The Junior College, p. 73.

## CHAPTER III

## THE JUNIOR COLLEGES IN OKLAHOMA

The junior college had its origin in Oklahoma with the establishment of Oklahoma Presbyterian College for Girls at Durant in 1910.<sup>1</sup> This institution had previously existed as Durant College and Calvin Missionary Institute, founded in 1894.

The University Preparatory School was founded by the Legislative Assembly of Oklahoma Territory, March 1, 1901, at Tonkawa. The college department was added in 1920 and the institution became known as the University Preparatory School and Junior College.

The first State Legislature established six district agriculture schools March 20, 1907. The purpose of these schools was to give work of secondary level, stressing agriculture and the related subjects. Since that time two of these institutions have been abolished and a third has become a four year college.

Murray State School of Agriculture, one of the three remaining schools, continued to function as a secondary agricultural school until 1924, when it was authorized to add junior college work.

Conners State School of Agriculture at Warner, and the Cameron State School of Agriculture at Lawton had

---

<sup>1</sup> Junior College Directory, Junior College Journal, January 1932, p. 245.



similar history. By an act of the Eleventh Legislature, approved March 24, 1927, the two institutions were given the status of junior colleges.

The first State Legislature in 1909 also established the Oklahoma School of Mines and Metallurgy at Wilburton. It was given junior college standing in 1927 and the name was changed to Eastern Oklahoma Junior College.

The Miami School of Mines was created by the State Legislature in 1919. At a special session of the State Legislature in 1924 the name was changed to Northeastern Oklahoma Junior College, and the institution was given the status of junior college.

The Oklahoma Military Academy was established in 1919 and was given authority to add junior college in 1923 by act of the State Legislature. This institution and Northeastern Oklahoma Junior College are members of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The State Board of Education has set up standards for accrediting junior colleges. The standards define a junior college:

A junior college is an institution of higher learning with a curriculum covering two years of college work which is based upon the content, or to supplement the work of secondary education as given in any accredited four year high school.

With reference to admission, they provide that:

The junior college shall require admission, at least fifteen units of high school work. The work of the junior college shall be organized on a college basis so as to secure equivalency in prerequisites, scope and thoroughness, the work done in the first two years of a standard college.

They require for teachers as follows:

The minimum school requirements of all teachers of classes in the junior college shall be graduate from a standard four year college and in addition, graduate work in a university of recognized standards amounting to one year presumably including the master's degree.

Other standards fix the size of classes, number of students, library and other equipment.

The State Board of Education has designated a committee which is responsible for the inspection of the state junior colleges. This committee is made up of one member each of the following: Oklahoma University, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College and The State Department of Education.

At present there is no law on the statute books of Oklahoma which establishes or regulates municipal junior colleges, yet there are thirteen such institutions in the state. The first public municipal junior college was established at Muskogee in 1920.

## CHAPTER IV

A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE BEARING ON  
THE SUCCESS OF PERFORMANCE OF THE JUNIOR  
COLLEGE TRANSFERS IN THE UNITED STATES

The preparatory function of the junior college has been its major work from the beginning. Over 3000 students in California junior colleges were asked, in 1929, "Will you go beyond the junior college in your education?" Ninety per cent of them answered in the affirmative.<sup>1</sup>

The work of the junior college is comparable to the lower division of the universities. How successful is the junior college transfer who enters the university as a junior in comparison with the work of the native student? This is the acid test of the success of the preparatory function. Data are available in answer to this question involving the experiences of several colleges and universities in different states.

The earliest investigation of this matter was made by Koos, who studied graduates of junior colleges in 1919, 1920, or 1921. He secured records of 95 junior college graduates who entered 13 universities and six colleges, and compared them with 75 juniors at the University of Minnesota. The median mark of the junior

---

<sup>1</sup>  
W. C. Eells and H. F. Jones, "Higher Educational Aspirations of California Junior College Students," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, Vol. 6, pp. 239-44.

college group was 80.6; of the Minnesota group, 79.8 which showed a slight superiority for the junior college group. This difference is not significant, in view of the small number concerned and the difficulty of comparing marks in 19 different institutions, where marking systems as well as standards varied widely. In this study, Koos made an extensive analysis of mental test scores and date, from which he concludes:

The most obvious point of significance in the findings just presented as to the mental character of junior college students is that the authorities in higher institutions, more especially our state universities, have little or no grounds for the fear that the junior college in its present state of development brings into their upper years a flood of mentally incompetent students. These data make clear that junior college students are in this respect about on a par with students of the same classification in most colleges and universities.<sup>2</sup>

The most extensive studies of junior college transfers have been made in California universities.

A brief study made at Stanford University of thirty junior college transfers in 1923-24, and of forty-four junior college transfers in 1924-25, showed almost exact identity of grades in comparison with all other students. The number of cases was too small to be of wide significance.

A more extensive investigation, made at Stanford by W. C. Eeels in 1927, dealt with eighty junior college

---

<sup>2</sup>

L. V. Koos, The Junior College, pp. 103-4.

transfers from 1923 to 1926. This study was supported by another and more extensive study by the same author. It dealt with transfers from three distinct types of public junior colleges in California: (1) independent junior colleges, (2) junior college departments of high schools, and (3) junior college departments connected with six of the state teachers' colleges.<sup>3</sup>

During the five years from 1923-24 to 1927-28, inclusive, Stanford University received 510 students by transfer from junior colleges, 212 from nine independent junior colleges in California, 40 from eight junior colleges of the high school type in California, 210 from six junior colleges of the teachers' college type in California, and 48 from fourteen non-California junior colleges scattered from Alabama to Washington. Of the 510 students, 317 had completed their courses in the junior colleges, and therefore entered Stanford University with upper division or junior year standing. Since this smaller group was more nearly homogeneous and more truly representative of the complete junior college product it was used as the basis of study. The group consisted of 264 men and 53 women. Comparisons were made of ability, and of accomplishment. The Thorndike Intelligence

---

3

W. C. Eells, The Junior College: Its Organization and Administration, pp. 170-87.

Examination was used for all undergraduates entering the Stanford University.<sup>4</sup>

No significant differences were found between the students from the different types of junior colleges, but very significant differences were found between the junior college students as a whole and the two groups used for comparison. The groups of junior college transfers, both men and women, showed marked superiority over the corresponding groups of native Stanford students, and slight superiority over upper division students transferring from standard four-year colleges. Similar results were found when the previous academic records were used as a measure of ability.

Four distinct measures of the actual accomplishment of the junior college transfers were used.

The academic accomplishment at Stanford University of each junior college transfer was computed for each quarter of residence work. The group of native Stanford men used for comparison represented an alphabetic sample of 200 men who entered Stanford University as freshmen in the autumn of 1922, 137 of whom graduated. The group of native Stanford women represented a similar sample of 51 women from the same class. It should be noted that these

---

<sup>4</sup>

W. C. Eells, The Junior College, pp. 256-7.

numbers cannot be taken as a measure of elimination since many of the students were still in the university when the study was made.<sup>5</sup>

✓ Facts regarding the survival of the junior college transfers indicate that nearly 85 per cent have graduated and the per cent increased each year during the four-year period studied. The native Stanford group used for the comparison have only slightly better survival records, and the superiority may be accounted for by the fact that they had had two previous years in the institution. First-year mortality in an institution is always the highest.<sup>6</sup>

A third measure of the accomplishment of the transfer students is shown by graduation honors received. Where normally 15 per cent of the graduates received honors, 23.6 per cent of the junior college transfers graduating achieved this distinction.<sup>7</sup>

✓ The fourth comparison consisted of the per cent of each group undertaking graduate work in the Stanford University. The contrast between the two records is striking. Almost 50 per cent of the transfer students undertook

---

<sup>5</sup> W. C. Eells, The Junior College, p. 258.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 260.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 261.

graduate work while only a little over 25 per cent of the native students have done so. Apparently the chances of securing students for graduate work among junior college transfers is twice as great as the chance of securing graduate students among those who entered the university as freshmen.<sup>8</sup> *Page - 29*

A study made by Showman at the University of California, Los Angeles, of 17 men and 36 women transfers shows a different picture from the study just considered at Stanford. He compared 53 transfer students with 250 native students over a period of four semesters and found the transfer students distinctly inferior to the native students. His figures are as follows:<sup>9</sup>

Men	Grade Point Average
Junior College . . .	1.30
Native California .	1.53

Women

Junior College . . . .	1.33
Native California . . .	1.54

Jones and Robinson also made a study in the University of California at Los Angeles of 409 junior college transfers from 24 junior colleges. This study was mainly concerned with the difference in the grade point average from the various junior colleges. There were from one to

---

<sup>8</sup>

W. C. Eells, The Junior College, p. 262.

<sup>9</sup>

Ibid., p. 266.



70 transfers from each of the 24 junior colleges and the range of the grade point ratio was from 1.7 to 0.7.<sup>10</sup>

Dean O. A. Shaw, of the University of Mississippi, at the seventh meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges gave a report on 56 graduates of Hillman Junior College. Every one of the graduates maintained a satisfactory standard in the institution of higher learning to which he went. He also reported on 96 transfers from Peral River Junior College. Those transfers ranked from A to B in the institutions transferred to during the first year.

The Report of the Texas Educational Survey Commission, published in 1924, gave studies of records of 100 transfer students to the University of Texas in comparison to 100 native students. The mean scholastic index was 57 for the transfers and 73 for the native students. The Commission commented:<sup>11</sup>

The conclusion seems justified by the facts, that, in so far as preparation for advanced college work of a high grade is concerned, the standard of work in junior colleges is low and inadequate. This leads to two conclusions: In the first place, there is need on the part of the state for closer supervision of existing institutions to protect students from ultimate failure in advanced work. In the second place, there must be close supervision and control in standards adopted for public and state supported junior colleges.

---

<sup>10</sup>

Ibid., p. 267.

<sup>11</sup>

C. H. Judd, Texas Educational Survey Report, Vol. 3, p. 45. Austin Texas, 1924.

In a report made before the Association of Texas Colleges in 1930, by Dean W. S. Allen, the records of 330 junior college graduates from 26 junior colleges, from 1910 to 1929, at Baylor University, were studied. The average grade was 83.4. For a random sample group of 330 students with four years at Baylor the average was 83.5. The grades were virtually the same.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>W. C. Eells, The Junior College, pp. 273-74.

## CHAPTER V

PERFORMANCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS  
IN OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

It is the object of this chapter to measure the success of the transfer students to the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in terms of grade point averages.

The study covers the records of 248 transfers from junior colleges in and outside of the state of Oklahoma and the lower division of the teachers' colleges of Oklahoma.

Because of the work being done on Whitehurst Hall, the regular location of the registrar's office, the students' records were kept in small quarters in the Engineering building.

The records were not easily accessible, and as a result, this study was made from the records of grades that were available to the author during the first two weeks of June and the first two weeks of July, 1937.

The selection of both native and transfer students was purely random, consisting of 52 junior college transfers and 188 native students who graduated from the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1937, and 198 transfer students that had finished an average of 33 college hours of work here at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College and were in school in 1936-37.

In the fall of 1937 the grades earned in this institution will be given the following values: A, 4 grade points; B, 3 grade points; C, 2 grade points; D, 1 grade point; F, no grade points. This new evaluation of grade points is used in this study. Under the old system and the one in most general use at the present time, A was given 3 grade points, B, 2 grade points, C, 1 grade point and D and F were given no grade points. Under this system the average or C grade was equivalent to one grade point. Under the new assignment of grade points, the C, or average grade is equal to two grade points. To those who have been accustomed to thinking of a one point as average, two points will be thought of as B. In this study the average grade, that is the middle grade, is 2.5 grade points. This is arrived at by taking an average of one hour of A, one hour of B, one hour of C and one hour of D.

The following table shows the grade point average in comparison to the psychological entrance examination.

Table II  
COMPARISON OF TRANSFER AND NATIVE GRADES GROUPED  
ACCORDING TO THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ENTRANCE TEST

Entrance Examination	0&1	2&3	4&5	6&7	8&9
Transfer grades	1.81	2.17	2.49	2.71	3.00
Native grades	1.44	1.84	2.09	2.26	2.76 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>

The test is scored and placed on the normal curve of distribution. Each two numbers represent a letter grade, for instance, the greatest number of cases fell into the group headed 4&5, which represents students with the ability to do "C", average, work.

✓ The 188 cases of native students made a grade point average of 2.52 in the lower division and a 2.83 grade point average in the upper division. The work in the upper division shows an increase of .31 grade point, which compares favorably with a study made by J. R. Gerbrich and R. L. Kerr at the University of Arkansas<sup>2</sup> and the study made by H. M. Shannon at the University of California at Los Angeles.<sup>3</sup>

✓ The 52 transfers made a grade point average of 2.68 in the junior colleges and 2.75 grade point average for the two years' work here at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. The transfers showed an increase of .07 grade point in their junior senior work here at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College over the work in the junior colleges.

Records of the choice of school for 388 boys and 140 girls from junior colleges of Oklahoma for the school years of 1935-36 and 1936-37 are shown in the tables below.

TABLE III  
SCHOOLS ENTERED FOR 528 TRANSFER STUDENTS  
THAT WERE ENROLLED AT OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL  
AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE IN 1935-36 and 1936-37

	Agricul- ture	Engi- neering	Com- merce	Home Economics	Educa- tion	Science Literature
Boys	107	109	98		22	52
Girls	1	2	19	45	35	38

<sup>2</sup>  
J. R. Gerbrich and R. L. Kerr, "Success of Transfers at the University of Arkansas, " Junior College Journal, January 1936, Vol. 6, p. 180.

<sup>3</sup>  
H. M. Shannon, Bulletin on Junior College Transfers, p. 3.

The following tables show the average number of college hours carried by the native and transfer students in the upper division at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College by semesters. A random selection of 26 native girls and 26 native boys are compared with 25 transfer girls and 26 transfer boys.

TABLE IV  
AVERAGE NUMBER OF COLLEGE HOURS CARRIED  
BY TRANSFER AND NATIVE STUDENTS IN THE UPPER  
DIVISION AT THE OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND  
MECHANICAL COLLEGE IN 1935-36 AND 1936-37

	SEMESTERS			
	5	6	7	8
Transfer Girls	15.64	15.56	15.80	14.80
Transfer Boys	15.54	15.15	15.81	16.73
Native Girls	15.54	16.10	15.61	15.04
Native Boys	16.57	17.68	16.59	15.61

In this study, 972 records of students were examined. Comparable data were obtained from the records of 433 students, both native and transferred. The transferred students represent state supported junior colleges, state municipal junior colleges, out-of-state junior colleges and three cases from state private junior colleges.

All cases used in this study are those of students who have received degrees from the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College ranging over the period of seven years from 1930 to 1937. There were three cases taken

from the records of 1930 and 256 cases from the records of 1937. The sampling was purely random as all available records of transfer students completing four semesters of work in junior colleges and lower division of teachers colleges were used in this study. A similar number of native students records were gathered at random.

The following tables show the relative performance of the transfer and native students by schools, sex and institutions transferred from. The grade point average of the transferred work is shown in the first column. The freshman and sophomore work of the native students is averaged and used in comparison with the transferred work. The work of both native and transfer students is shown by semesters in the junior and senior years at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

TABLE V  
GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF 15 NATIVE AND 14 TRANSFER  
STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS

	*Lower Division	By 5	Semesters 6	7	8	**Upper Division
Native Women	2.47	2.59	2.48	2.83	2.93	2.71
Transfer Women	2.48	2.49	2.53	2.54	2.61	2.54

\*Freshman and Sophomore College Work.

\*\*Junior and Senior College Work.

From this random sampling, the school of agriculture received the greatest number of transfer students.

TABLE VI  
GRADE POINT AVERAGES OF 53 NATIVE AND 40  
TRANSFER STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Natives	2.54	2.87	2.85	2.86	2.88	2.87
Transfers	2.84	2.58	2.43	2.55	2.72	2.57

Transfer students entering the school of commerce showed the greatest decline in grade point average for the first semester of junior work at A. & M. The transfers dropped .48 grade points while the native students raised .19 grade points during the fifth semester work as compared with the first two years of college work.

TABLE VII  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF 40 NATIVE AND 24  
TRANSFER STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF COMMERCE

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Natives	2.55	2.74	2.72	2.97	2.98	2.85
Transfers	2.81	2.33	2.66	2.69	2.94	2.66

Native students in the school of science and literature showed the highest grade point average of any group in this study.

TABLE VIII  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE FOR 20 NATIVE AND 27 TRANSFER  
STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND LITERATURE

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Native	2.57	3.06	2.82	3.12	3.09	2.02
Transfer	2.82	2.59	2.58	2.68	2.80	2.66



TABLE IX  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF 41 NATIVE AND 20  
TRANSFER STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Native	2.31	2.48	2.79	2.73	2.93	2.73
Transfer	2.86	2.46	2.54	2.97	2.86	2.71

TABLE X  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE FOR 12 NATIVE AND 22  
TRANSFER STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Native	2.63	2.67	2.67	2.90	3.16	2.85
Transfer	2.74	2.60	2.65	2.75	2.86	2.72

A study of transfer and native students at Stanford University in California made by C. W. Eeels showed that women students were slightly superior to men students. This study also reveals that women have a higher grade point average than men as shown by the table below.

TABLE XI  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE FOR 56 NATIVE WOMEN, 61 NATIVE  
MEN, 43 TRANSFER WOMEN AND 43 TRANSFER MEN

	Lower Division	5	By Semesters			Upper Division
			6	7	8	
Native Women	2.59	2.79	2.84	2.90	2.97	2.88
Native Men	2.46	2.66	2.75	2.90	2.93	2.81
Transfer Women	2.76	2.52	2.57	2.72	2.88	2.67
Transfer Men	2.60	2.51	2.63	2.60	2.82	2.64

In the following table, all available cases of transfers from out-of-state junior colleges, municipal junior colleges in Oklahoma and transfers from the lower division of Oklahoma State Teachers Colleges were used in comparison with 39 students from Oklahoma State controlled junior colleges.

TABLE XII  
GRADE POINT AVERAGE FOR 27 OUT-OF-STATE  
JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS, 33 OKLAHOMA MUNICIPAL  
JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS, 39 OKLAHOMA STATE  
CONTROLLED JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFERS AND 17  
TRANSFERS FROM THE LOWER DIVISION OF OKLAHOMA  
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGES

	Lower		By Semesters				Upper
	Div.	5	6	7	8		Div.
Out-of-State	2.59	2.75	2.88	2.93	3.02		2.89
Municipal	2.51	2.65	2.72	2.79	2.95		2.77
State Controlled	2.77	2.62	2.67	2.65	2.86		2.70
Teachers Colleges	2.62	2.52	2.42	2.86	2.81		2.65

The following table shows a comparison of transfer students from three state supported junior colleges and a random selection of native students from Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. There were not enough available cases of transfers from Conners State Junior College, Northeastern Oklahoma Junior College, Eastern Oklahoma Junior College and Oklahoma Military Academy to be used in this comparison.

TABLE XIII  
 GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF 21 STUDENTS FROM  
 MURRAY STATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE, 30 STUDENTS  
 FROM THE UNIVERSITY PREPARATORY SCHOOL  
 AND JUNIOR COLLEGE, 38 STUDENTS FROM CAMERON  
 STATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND 86 NATIVE STUDENTS  
 OF OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

	Lower Div.	By Semesters				Upper Division
		5	6	7	8	
Murray	2.59	2.27	2.67	2.60	2.57	2.53
Okla. Prep.	2.85	2.65	2.55	2.68	2.76	2.66
Cameron	2.83	2.21	2.30	2.49	2.67	2.42
Native	2.53	2.78	2.79	2.90	2.95	2.87

## CONCLUSION

This study has dealt specifically with the performance of transferred students from junior colleges and the lower division of teachers colleges as contrasted with native students of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.

A brief survey was made of the literature bearing upon the performance of junior college students in senior institutions throughout the United States. The substance of these studies was: junior college transfers to higher institutions in California were slightly superior to the native students; transfer students to higher institutions in Texas were slightly inferior to distinctly inferior to the native students; transfer students to the University of Arkansas were distinctly inferior to native students.

A study made at the University of Chicago, using the same method of evaluating grades as is used in this study, showed the grade point average of native students for the junior and senior years to be 3.20; the grade point average for the transfer students over the same period of time was 2.74. The grade point average of native students in the junior and senior years at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, as found in this study, was 2.85; the grade point average for the transfer students was found to be 2.65.

Junior college students who graduated from the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1937 showed superiority over those who graduated at an earlier date. This indicates that the junior colleges of Oklahoma are making a permanent place in higher education in the State.))

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, H. D. "Whose Children Attend Junior Colleges?"  
Junior College Journal, IV (January 1934), 165-72.
- Chambers, M. M. "Junior College Status in the Middle  
West." The Junior College Journal, III (January  
1933), 185-90.
- Campbell, D. S. "Junior College Directory." Junior  
College Journal, II (January 1932), 235-48.
- Conroe, I. A. "Ideal Junior College Curriculum." Junior  
College Journal, VI (May 1936), 384-91.
- Eells, W. C. The Junior College. Houghton Mifflin  
Company, 1931.
- Eells, W. C. "Junior College Costs." School and Society,  
XXXV (April 10, 1937), 524-28.
- Eells, W. C. "Abolition of Lower Division: Early History."  
Junior College Journal, VI (January 1936), 193-95.
- Harper, W. R. President's Annual Report. University of  
Chicago Press, 1902.
- Hill, M. E. "Junior College Development in California."  
Junior College Journal, VI (April 1936), 333-38.
- James, E. M. "Commercial Education in the Junior College."  
Junior College Journal, VI (February 1936), 242-44.
- Judd, C. H. Texas Educational Survey. University of  
Texas Press, 1924.
- Koos, L. V. The Junior College. University of Minnesota  
Press, 1924.

- Littel, C. L. "Effect of State Supported Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, VI (May 1936), 409-11.
- Potts, A. M. "Selection of Students for Terminal Courses." Junior College Journal, V (May 1935), 426-28.
- Report. The First Annual Junior College Conference.  
University of California Press, 1931.
- Sutton, W. A. "Ideals of the Junior College." Junior College Journal, VII (April 1937), 342-245.
- Whitney, F. L. "Reflective Thinking in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, VII (April 1937), 341-44.
- Webb, P. E. "Analysis of Junior College Offerings." Junior College Journal, VI (April 1936), 339-346

Typist:

Mrs. Florence Lackey

Stillwater, Oklahoma